



United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/680,177	10/05/2000	Mitsuaki Oshima	2000-1391	6208
7590 02/04/2004		EXAMINER		
Wenderoth Lind & Ponack L L P			LE, AMANDA T	
2033 K Street N Suite 800	I W		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Washington, DC 20006			2634	30
			DATE MAILED: 02/04/2004	1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Applicant(s)	
OSHIMA ET AL.	
Art Unit	
2634	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 1/12/04 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]
 a)
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension ee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension ee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if imely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on 12 January 2004. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
(a) X they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7.⊠ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)⊠ will not be entered or b)☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed:
Claim(s) objected to:
Claim(s) rejected:
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:
8.⊠ The drawing correction filed on <u>12 January 2004</u> is a)⊠ approved or b)□ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)
10. ☐ Other:





demodulation" (claim 37, 40, 41) requires further consideration and/or search.

Response to Arguments Applicant's arguments filed 1/12/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In the remark, Applicants contend that "The synchronization of Farias that the Examiner equates to the claimed data for demodulation is a higher energy level of the secondary channel, and is therefore not "data" that can be ECC encoded". It is the Examiner's position that the Farias et al reference teach that the symbols of the secondary channel having "higher energy level" are ECC encoded (see Farias, col. 10, lines 55-58). And, the symbols of the secondary channel having "higher energy leve" are the nformation used for synchronization purpose. The claimed limitation of "ECC encode the data for demodulation" is met by the Farias et al reference. The rejection applied to claims 30-35, as stated in the Final Office Action, is therefore maintained.

> AMANDAT. LE PRIMARY EXAMINER

Amanda